

Reisch, Timothy A CIV NAVFAC MID ATLANTIC

From: Paul.Landin@CH2M.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2006 11:07 AM
To: Reisch, Timothy A CIV NAVFAC MID ATLANTIC; damiller@deq.virginia.gov; Franklin.Greyson@epamail.epa.gov; Clifford, Peter J CIV 106.3, C106.3; Host, Mike M CIV 106.3, C106.3
Cc: daniel.holloway@CH2M.com; donna.caldwell@CH2M.com; jamie.butler@CH2M.com; Watson.Linda@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Draft Final RI/HHRA/FFS for Site 10
Attachments: Draft final RI-HHRA-FFS Site 10_NNSY_EPA_DEQ041706.doc

PMT -

Attached is the "Draft Final" version of the RI with PMT comments incorporated following the March meeting. In addition, we provided the EPA - HHRA comments/revisions to Linda Watson in a separate email (dated April 6, 2006).

Her email response (dated April 12, 2006) to the revisions was:

"Hello Everyone,

I had a chance to look over the changes and I have the following comment to offer:

Tox Comment 2: Although Appendix D-1 (specifically Tables 2.2 and 2.4) provide exactly what I was looking for, the section now omits the soil* air screening tables for Dry Dock 8 that was included in the draft report. Please include this screening table because the samples used to screen Dry Dock 8 differ from those that were used to screen soil* alone.

Once the above table(s) has been included within the report, I have no additional comments to offer."

We had our HHRA folks look into this as we did not remove anything from the dry dock evaluation. Attachment D-1 Table 2s (2.1 and 2.2) are specifically for the Residential Exposure Scenario. Attachment D-2 is for the Dry Dock 8 Construction Worker exposure scenario. In the Draft RI/HHRA/FFS, these tables were blended due to a production error and the distinction was not clear. This was corrected in the PDF to EPA. However, the exposure medium in Table 2.2, Attachment D-2 in the April 6 PDF file should have been "Air " instead of "soil*". This will be changed for FINAL distribution.

This email includes a "clean" copy of the text revisions as we reviewed collectively during the March PMT meeting. The HHRA component has been previously provided and are discussed above. There are also minor figure adjustments to the property boundary, and the cost estimate appendix has been edited to remove reference to signage or fencing, and to more clearly explain the present worth cost basis for an assumed 30-year duration (albeit it indefinite in reality) to enforce and maintain the LUCs.

Please review and provide any additional comment you may have. If you have minor, grammatical edits (e.g., not necessary for formal Navy response), please make them in red-line mode to the word document. If you have major comments, please highlight and insert in comment mode so they can be combined for a Navy response.

We would appreciate comments at least one week (by May 3) in advance of the next PMT meeting so we have

4/20/2006

time to review/respond and address at the May PMT meeting, where we hope to reach consensus on this document to move forward as FINAL.

I will also be sending the DRAFT Proposed Plan for Site 10 which has been drafted with consideration of comments received on the Site 10 RI/HHRA/FFS and from the comments received from EPA-ORC on the Proposed Plan for Site 17.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Paul

Paul A. Landin, P.E.
Project Manager
CH2M HILL
5700 Cleveland Street, Suite 101
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23462
ph: 757.671.8311, x412
plandin@ch2m.com

4/20/2006